

NEWS RELEASE

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

CONTACT LYNN HOLTON PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER (415)865-7738 RELEASE DATE: October 12, 1999

RELEASE #: S.C. 41/99

SUMMARY OF CASES ACCEPTED DURING THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 4, 1999

[This news release is issued to inform the public and the press of cases that the Supreme Court has accepted and of their general subject matter. The description or descriptions set out below do not necessarily reflect the view of the court, or define the specific issues that will be addressed by the court.]

#99-152 <u>Bellardine</u> v. <u>AppleOne Employment Services</u>, S080681.

(B127234.) Unpublished opinion. Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a motion to compel arbitration.

#99-153 <u>Maciejewski</u> v. <u>Alpha Systems Lab, Inc.</u>, S081796. (G021588; 73 Cal.App.4th 1372.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order denying a motion to compel arbitration.

#99-154 <u>Pichly</u> v. <u>Nortech Waste</u>, S081487. (C029714; 73 Cal.App.4th 447.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed an order denying a motion to compel arbitration.

<u>Bellardine</u>, <u>Maciejewski</u>, and <u>Pichly</u> all include issues, concerning the enforceability of arbitration agreements that are claimed to be unconscionable, which are related to issues before the court in <u>Armendariz</u> v. <u>Foundation Health</u> Psychare Services, Inc., S075942. (See #99-32.)

#99-155 <u>Galland v. City of Clovis</u>, S080670. (F025257; 73 Cal.App.4th 371.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed the judgment in a civil action. This case presents issues concerning whether a landlord may have a remedy under 42 U.S.C. section 1983 when a municipal rent control board has improperly denied a requested rent increase.

#99-156 People v. Pierce, S081047. (F027557; 72 Cal.App.4th 1448.)

Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. This case presents an issue, concerning whether the admission of evidence of prior sex offenses to show propensity violates due process, which is related to an issue before the court in People v. Falsetta, S071521. (See #98-107.)

DISPOSITION

#98-22 <u>Agnew</u> v. <u>State Bd. of Equalization</u>, S067358, was dismissed and remanded to the Court of Appeal.